

101 E. Wanda,  
Garland, Texas  
Feb. 15, 1964.

Mr. William J. Alexander,  
Assistant District Attorney,  
Dallas, Texas.

Dear Mr. Alexander:

Attorney Jonahill said that they would want to know if a prospective juror was prejudiced against Fullerton because of his religion or his association with strippers. Well, there are several things to say about the remark. (1) It is a fact that ~~most~~ the non-Evangelical Jews, like Fullerton was, are lost, and ~~have~~ knowledge of a fact does not prejudice people. Prejudice means, to judge before having the facts. (2) He was not only associated with strippers, but he ran a strip-tease business. (3) It is a fact that such a business is immoral; and knowledge of a fact, like I have already shown, cannot

25-61

prejudice people. (4) A Law of God teaches that either you are against rejectors of Christ or you are against acceptors of Christ. Jesus said, "Either you are with me, or you are against me." A non - Evangelical juror is infinitely more apt to make prejudgments (which is the definition of prejudice) than are Evangelicals.

Mr. Jonchill said, "We intend to examine prospective jurors' Conscious, subconscious, and unconscious thoughts." There is no such a thing as <sup>an</sup> unconscious thought. The concept is self-contradictory. The Psychological concept of the unconscious mind is repugnant to the word of God in the Bible. There ~~may~~ <sup>is</sup> such a thing as the subconscious; but it ~~more~~ is never essentially different from the Conscious, but is only a lesser degree of consciousness. It is what St. Paul was talking about when he said, "In this earthly life, we oftentimes see through a glass darkly." The subconscious is what we know deep

down in our hearts, or it is what we know "in the back of our heads" (to use a popular expression). Many times, when one fears that God might not have forgiven him of a sin, he has sufficient knowledge in his subconscious mind that God has forgiven him. So don't let Josiah ~~be~~ influence <sup>you</sup> to think that Rullenstein could have consciously been a keeper of the law and subconsciously a breaker of the law.

I don't need to know the specific things the 3 psychiatrists have to say about the recent examination of Rullenstein's brain. All I need to know is that men, like Rullenstein, are declared to be insane only by means of the modern concept of insanity, which is <sup>concept</sup> totally heretical, or repugnant to the word of God in the Bible, and that no insanity compels a person to kill the Bible. All of the criteria which are used by modern psychiatry are heresies, and I can point out about

Professor Louis L. Jaffe, of Harvard University Law School, made a speech at the University of Texas Law School. And in this speech he said that it may be that we will have to have a judicial policing of the press, to prevent the press from printing statements which interfere with a fair trial. But ~~any judicial policing of the press is a violation of the standards of the people because this is a government by the people. Because the people believe in the right to free press this is a government by the people.~~ Nothing in the Constitution is more nearly absolute than is the <sup>guarantee of the</sup> right to free press. The people are the Court of last resort, next to Christianity. Next to Christianity, the people are to decide as to whether some news reports interfere with a fair trial. A judicial policing of the press, which is ~~conflicting with the under the law~~ <sup>is a violation of the standards of the people, which is like a police state set up.</sup> of course, judges would have to be involved in the policing of the press,



experts be the Court of last resort, ~~the~~ according to what the word of God in the Bible says about the matter, ~~the experts~~ ~~Pitts says about the matter, the experts~~ will be preachers, and not secular lawmen. But I doubt that the Harvard law professor was advocating this kind of ~~expert~~ ~~ultra~~ ultimate expertise.

Mr. Hegerly said that Dallas police should have barred the press from the police station after the shooting of President Kennedy, ~~on the argument~~ <sup>and</sup> that police spokesmen could have come outside and made a report ~~about~~ about the case. But that, ~~like~~ would have been ungodly, unconstitutional, and a police-state system. ~~It~~ would have been ungodly, because Jesus said, "Nothing shall I hid that shall not be revealed.... What is said in secrecy will be hauled from the house top." And the Fundamental Christian doctrine of individualism teaches that every individual has the right to know, ~~and~~ since any individual can recognize and expose

injustice, as well as a billion people can.

Sincerely yours,  
Rev. Cecil Greenham.

P.S. Attorney Melvin Belli <sup>Belli</sup> ~~said~~ was asked on T.V. if he would try to prove Rubinstein was insane. And Belli answered, "not in these words, but we will just enter a plea of not guilty." But Belli cannot get by with the <sup>criminal justice</sup> ~~business~~ of using some term which would connote an association of sanity with insanity. Because I know that God won't let him get by with it at the Court of last resort, and I am confident that the Dallas prosecution won't let him get by with it. There is an infinite difference between sanity and insanity. ~~Only on a plea of insanity or on the argument that there~~

There are only 2 pleas which Belli could enter at the trial. (1) The plea that there is a Christian law which is above the law that Rubinstein committed murder, and that Christian law would make Rubinstein not guilty. And (2) The plea of insanity.

in light of what I have already said about <sup>8.</sup>  
Psychiatry, psychiatrists are some of the most unqualified

~~psychiatrists are, the most unqualified~~  
~~superior of, or judges of, a brain~~  
~~examination. of the report which~~  
~~the Dallas news reporter gave of~~  
~~the brain examination, that~~  
~~correct. It is incredible that~~  
~~any carrier, the 3 psychiatrists who~~  
~~not have waited until now to say so.~~

Mr. Imahell also said he would  
want to know what the prospective  
jurors thought about President Kennedy.  
But if any one assumes that ~~the~~ the  
president of the U.S. is a good man,  
unconditionally, he is committing  
blasphemy or ~~is~~ is advocating the  
belief in a Godless humanism. Any  
juror who, ~~is~~ <sup>was</sup> ~~is~~ for Kennedy  
would be as apt to be prejudiced  
for Reuther as a ~~juror~~ <sup>juror</sup> who was  
against Kennedy would be apt to be  
against the ~~juror~~

~~prejudiced~~

prejudices against the ~~juror~~  
~~since all of the former Christians~~  
~~since no Evangelical would be about~~  
~~his attitude toward Kennedy, all possible~~



would, consequently <sup>he</sup> prejudices <sup>2</sup> for Jack  
~~about their passion for Jack~~  
~~Ruthenstern's brother, who, it would be~~  
~~resolute down to the defense's saying, "The court must choose~~  
~~my prejudices, rather than any body~~  
~~else's prejudices." How - impartial a~~  
~~jury like that would be!~~

A woman said ~~she~~ it was an-  
 nounced on T.V. that Ruthenstern ac-  
 cepted Jesus Christ. If that is true,  
 and the truth is known, then he should  
 not have to receive more punishment  
 than 2 years in the penitentiary.  
~~If they don't have to give a reward~~  
~~for rejecting a prophet, they could~~  
~~reject a prophet, just because he~~  
~~says that, you Evangelical guys were lost~~  
~~seeing detectives grab the man~~  
~~whom it~~  
 man the former saw shoot Oswald  
 is proof that the defender supplied  
 at the trial is the real killer.

C.S.G.